Before The
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

Requests For Clarification	)	**CCB/CPD 97-24**
Of The Commission's Rules	)	**CC Docket 96-98**
Regarding Interconnection	)	**CC Docket 95-185**
Between LECs And Paging Carriers	)	

COMMENTS BY ALLIED PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA ("ALLIED") ON REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE COMMISSION'S RULES REGARDING INTERCONNECTION BETWEEN LECS AND PAGING CARRIERS

Allied is a non-profit trade association which for more than thirty years has represented the interests of paging and conventional mobile service providers in California. Allied submits these comments in opposition to the positions taken by Southwestern Bell Telephone ("SWBT") in its April 25, 1997 letter to the Common Carrier Bureau ("Bureau"). The SWBT letter misinterprets current law, and in at least one critical respect is directly contrary to admissions made by SWBT's affiliate, Pacific Bell, in a precedent-setting California arbitration proceeding.

Allied agrees with the conclusions reached by the letter dated May 16, 1997 from counsel for three of the major national paging carriers.[1] The Eight Circuit stay does not apply either to the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("Act"), or to the critical definitional sections of the

[1] AirTouch Paging, AT&T Wireless Services, Inc., and PageNet, Inc.

Commission's rules. "Telecommunications carriers" are entitled to the interconnection benefits of the Act. 47 U.S.C. §251(a). "Telecommunications carriers" include providers of commercial mobile radio services ("CMRS"). 47 U.S.C. §3(44). Paging carriers are CMRS providers. 47 U.S.C.§3(24); 47 C.F.R.§§20.3, 51.5. Paging carriers are therefore entitled to the interconnect-related benefits of the Act, including the right to reimbursement for their additional costs of transporting and terminating LEC-originated local calls. The latter is sometimes referred to as a right to "reciprocal" compensation. 47 U.S.C. §251(b)(5).

The Bureau's letter of March 3, 1997 states that paging carriers have standing under Section 251(b)(5), i.e., the reciprocal compensation statute. This echoes paragraphs 1088, 1092, and 1093 of the First Report and Order, FCC 96 -325 (rel. Aug. 8, 1996) which affirm the right of one-way service providers to the benefits and burdens of Section 251(b)(5). The Bureau also finds that §51.703(b) of the Regulations - which is not stayed - requires that "an LEC may not assess charges on any other telecommunications carrier for local telecommunications traffic that originates on the LEC's network". According to the Bureau, this necessarily includes charges to paging carriers.

SWBT quibbles about whether §51.703(b) involves only usage-sensitive charges by the LECs, or whether it also proscribes facilities charges. To distinguish between the two is pure casuistry: if §51.703(b) were restricted to usage-sensitive charges, the LECs would simply convert such charges into facilities fees. The net result would be to defeat entirely the intent of §51.703(b) as well as the mandate of §251(b)(5), which is based on the clear responsibility of originating carriers either to furnish their own transport and terminating facilities, or, if they utilize the facilities of others, to provide compensation.

Perhaps realizing the weakness in its narrow reading of §51.703(b), SWBT suggests (at page 2 of its letter) that paging-only carriers should be excluded entirely from the regulation - and §251(b)(5) on the ground that they do not originate traffic for termination on the LEC's network. This issue was, of course, faced by the Commission in the First Report and Order, and was resolved in favor of the paging carriers. SWBT and others have sought reconsideration of this and other parts of the First Report and Order, and the matter is now submitted. This is not the time or place to resurrect the issue.

The same argument was faced very recently by the California Public Utilities Commission ("CPUC") in what to the best of Allied's knowledge is the first paging-specific arbitration proceeding under the Act. In Cook Telecom, Inc. vs. Pacific Bell, SWBT's affiliate initially persuaded the Arbitrator that "reciprocal" compensation for purposes of §251(b)(5) required that where two carriers exchange traffic, each of them must both originate and terminate calls on the other's system. After considering extensive briefs from many parties, the CPUC rejected the Arbitrator's Report, and found that the words "reciprocal" and "mutual" should be interpreted simply to assure compensation to any carrier terminating the traffic of another. Thus:

> ...Under Section 252(d)(2) the state is to ensure that "terms and conditions for reciprocal compensation" "provide for the mutual and reciprocal recovery by each carrier of costs associated with the transport and termination on each carrier's network facilities of calls that originate on the network facilities of the other carrier." (emph. added).
>
> In creating these duties, Congress did not carve out an exception with respect to those telecommunications carriers providing a telecommunications service that consisted of one-way paging. To the contrary, Congress broadly required local exchange carriers to interconnect with all providers of communication services meeting

> the definitional sections of the Act, and to compensate each carrier on reasonable terms and conditions for the costs that it incurs in terminating calls to the called party that originated on the local exchange carrier's network. Decision 97-05-095, Application 97-02-003 (May 21, 1997) (copy attached).

The CPUC concluded that pursuant to a prior stipulation by the parties, qualification under §251(b)(5) brought with it the requirement that intercarrier facilities' charges be pro-rated, and, for paging traffic, assigned entirely to the LEC as originating party.

It is hard to imagine how a different result could even have been considered. In a cellular context, Pacific Bell and other LECs fiercely insisted on their right to termination compensation, and on the duty of the originating carrier to shoulder facilities charges where 90% (or more) of the relevant calls were originated on a CMRS network. Having insisted on the point as to two-way CMRS providers, it is difficult to see how the LECs can avoid their own parallel obligation when traffic balances are reversed.

There is also the practical problem posed by many telecommunications carriers which offer paging services along with two-way services. The evidence in the Cook proceeding is that Pacific Bell's own PCS entity (Pacific Bell Mobile Services, or "PBMS") actively markets paging, voice mail, and two-way mobile services to the public. Since the Cook proceeding, GTE has filed its Advice Letter 8471, which asks approval for an interconnection agreement with PBMS. The agreement provides for apportioned facilities charges as well as for termination compensation for PBMS at the same rate regardless of whether the call is land-to mobile or land-to-pager. Cellular companies have also reached agreements with LECs providing for termination compensation, and the proration of facilities charges, where land-to-pager calls are co-mingled with calls going in the other direction. SWBT does not tell the Commission exactly how many LEC-terminated calls

would be necessary to qualify a paging carrier for equal treatment. Nor does it seek to justify the obvious unfairness that would result in a rule that provided reduced facilities charges to some paging service providers (i.e., PCS and cellular entities), but not to others (paging-only companies).

SWBT attempts to distinguish paging-only companies by labeling them "cost causers". At the outset it should be noted that the "cost causer" in a land-to-pager context is the originating carrier, i.e., SWBC, and not the terminating paging carrier. SWBC complains, however, that when SWBT handles calls between its own subscribers, it is able to collect from both the calling and the called party, but that when it terminates a call on a paging system, it is only able to collect from the originating party. The argument goes too far for the simple reason that it applies to all non-LECs, including those as to which SWBT has conceded its obligations under the Act. All calls interchanged between telecommunications carriers result in a second carrier taking over functions that would otherwise be performed by the originating carrier. All such calls are by definition addressed to non-LEC customers who pay the LEC nothing. However, the latter typically avoids significant costs, including the switching functions that would otherwise be performed by the LEC's terminating end office, and the need to construct and maintain the loop to the terminating customer. In the Cook Telecom arbitration, Pacific Bell admitted to avoided costs of approximately one-half cent per call for calls routed through its tandem offices to paging switches. SWBT's representation that paging carriers add to its costs is simply not true.

This Commission has found clearly that paging carriers are entitled to the benefits and burdens of §251(b)(5). It has implemented its finding in various regulations, including §51.703 which is unstayed. §51.703(b) establishes the right of all telecommunications carriers not to be

charged for traffic originating on LEC systems. The same rationale for relieving terminating carriers of usage sensitive charges should relieve them of non-usage sensitive facilities charges. This principle has already been recognized by many LECs in the proration clauses in their agreements with two-way telecommunications carriers. As confirmed by the First Report and Order, there is simply no reason to exclude one way carriers from the general principle.

Dated: June 12, 1997.

Respectfully Submitted,

ALLIED PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS
INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA

By: 

DAVID M. WILSON, ESQ.
YOUNG, VOGL, HARLICK,
WILSON & SIMPSON LLP
425 California Street, Suite 425
San Francisco, California 94104
Telephone: (415) 291-1970
Facsimile: (415) 291-1984
Its Attorneys

DMW:jdi
File:15855.24.8

COM/JXK/sid *

Mailed

MAY 23 1997

Decision 97-05-095 May 21, 1997

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Cook Telecom, Inc., for arbitration pursuant to Section 252 of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996 to establish an interconnection agreement with Pacific Bell.	)	Application 97-02-003 (Filed February 3, 1997)

David M. Wilson and David A. Simpson, Attorneys at Law, for Cook Telecom, Inc., applicant.
Thomas J. Ballo and David Discher, Attorneys at Law, for Pacific Bell, respondent.
Karen Jones, Marc Kolb and Mike Watson, for the Commission's Telecommunications Division.

INTERIM OPINION

1. Summary

We reject the Arbitrated Interconnection Agreement between Cook Telecom, Inc. (Cook or applicant) and Pacific Bell (Pacific or respondent) because it fails to provide for compensation to Cook for the costs that Cook incurs in terminating calls to its paging customers. Accordingly, the agreement fails to comply with Sections 251(b)(5) and 252(d)(2)(A)(i) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (Act) and our Rules Governing Filings Made Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Resolution ALJ-168 (Rules). We further order the parties to file an agreement in conformance with this decision.

2. Background

On February 3, 1997, Cook filed a timely application for arbitration of terms, conditions and rates for interconnection with Pacific. Pacific filed a timely response on February 28, 1997.

Arbitration hearings were held on March 12 and 13, 1997. Opening briefs were filed and served on March 24, 1997, and reply briefs were filed and served on March 31, 1997.

An Arbitrator's Report was filed and served on April 21, 1997. On April 28, 1997, parties filed and served a conformed agreement in compliance with the Arbitrator's Report. On May 2, 1997, parties filed and served comments on the Arbitrator's Report and the conformed agreement.

3. Arbitrated Agreement

The threshold issue is whether applicant is entitled to transport and termination compensation. We conclude, contrary to the Arbitrator's Report, that applicant is so entitled pursuant to the Act.

Under Rule 4.2.4, we may reject an arbitrated agreement or portions thereof that do not meet the requirements of Section 251 of the Act, regulations prescribed under Section 251 by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC), or the pricing standards set forth in Section 252(d) of the Act. Pursuant to Section 252(e)(3) of the Act, we may also reject agreements or portions thereof which violate other requirements of the Commission. For the reasons set forth below, we reject the arbitrated agreement filed by the parties and order the parties to file an agreement in compliance with this decision.

3.1 Act and FCC Regulations

Respondent has a duty under Section 251 "to establish reciprocal compensation arrangements for the transport and termination of telecommunications." (Section 251(b)(5).) Section 252(d) further provides that a State Commission shall not consider terms and conditions for reciprocal compensation just and reasonable unless the "terms and conditions provide for the mutual and reciprocal recovery" of costs "by each carrier." (Section 252(d)(2)(A)(i).)

Applicant is a one-way paging company. Applicant does not originate traffic for termination on respondent's network. Respondent argues that because traffic flows only one-way -- i.e., respondent always terminates traffic on the applicant's network -- and respondent never terminates traffic on its network from the applicant, applicant is not entitled to compensation because such compensation is not "mutual" or "reciprocal" within the meaning of Section 251(b)(5) of the Act.

We disagree. Under Section 251(a) of the Act, respondent has a duty to interconnect with applicant who otherwise qualifies as a "telecommunications carrier" providing "telecommunications service" within the meaning of the Act. (47 U.S.C.§§3(44) & (46)). In fulfilling this duty, respondent has an obligation under Section 251(b)(5) "to establish reciprocal compensation arrangements for the transport and termination of telecommunications." Under Section 252(d)(2) the state is to ensure that "terms and conditions for reciprocal compensation" "provide for the mutual and reciprocal recovery by each carrier of costs associated with the transport and termination on each carrier's network facilities of calls that originate on the network facilities of the other carrier." (emph. added).

In creating these duties, Congress did not carve out an exception with respect to those telecommunications carriers providing a telecommunications service that consisted of one-way paging. To the contrary, Congress broadly required local exchange carriers to interconnect with all providers of communication services meeting the definitional sections of the Act, and to compensate each carrier on reasonable terms and conditions for the costs that it incurs in terminating calls to the called party that originate on the local exchange carrier's network.

Respondent does not dispute that there are costs incurred by applicant in terminating calls to applicant's customers. We do not think that Congress intended a result that, on the one hand,

would require respondent to compensate a carrier providing two-way wireless service for the costs that the carrier incurs, but on the other hand, allow respondent to deny compensation to a carrier providing one-way wireless service for the costs that such carrier incurs. To be sure, when respondent terminates calls on its network from cellular and other wireless providers, respondent is compensated for the costs that it incurs in terminating such traffic. We believe that Congress intended that each and every carrier should be compensated for the costs that it incurs in terminating traffic, and did not intend to deny a class of carriers -- in this case, one-way paging -- the right of compensation simply because there is no traffic terminated on the local exchange carrier's network. We fail to discern any public policy that Congress intended to further by denying such compensation to one-way paging carriers when, at the same time, Congress went to such great lengths to grant such carriers the right to interconnect and compete on an equal footing under the Act. We believe that Congress simply recognized that historically, while local exchange carriers have been compensated by competitors for terminating competitors' traffic, the local exchange carrier should reciprocate by compensating competitors for terminating the local exchange carrier's traffic.

Our construction of the Act is consistent with that adopted by the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC"). In Local Competition Provisions of the 1996 Telecommunications Act, First Report and Order, 11 FCC Rcd 15499 (Aug.1, 1996), the FCC promulgated regulations pursuant to the Act that required all LECs [local exchange carriers] to enter into reciprocal compensation arrangements with all CMRS [commercial mobile radio service] providers, including paging providers, for the transport and termination of traffic." Id. at para. 1008. The FCC was careful to expressly specify, and clarify any perceived ambiguity, that paging providers are included in the class of CMRS providers

entitled to compensation for terminating traffic. See also id. at para. 1092 ("... paging providers, as telecommunications carriers, are entitled to mutual compensation for the transport and termination of local traffic...") and para. 1093 ("we direct states, when arbitrating disputes under Section 252(d)(2), to establish rates for the termination of traffic by paging providers based on forward-looking economic costs of such termination to the paging provider.") The FCC's policies are consistent with our interpretation of the Act that Congress intended to compensate all carriers, including one-way paging carriers, for terminating traffic.

3.2 Termination and Transport

Respondent next claims that applicant does not transport and terminate traffic, and hence does not qualify for compensation under the Act. We disagree. As discussed above, paging carriers qualify as telecommunication carriers providing telecommunications services within the meaning of the Act. When a caller dials a paging customer, the call is initially transported on the local exchange carrier's network, and then handed off to the paging carrier for ultimate delivery to the called party. As explained by applicant, dedicated trunks pick up land-to-pager calls at [respondent's] tandem offices. These facilites then carry such calls to Cook's terminals. Exhibit 1 (Cook Testimony). In this arbitration, both parties agreed that similar dedicated trunks are used to connect respondent's end-offices to applicant's paging terminals. We agree with applicant that it provides termination and hence applicant should be compensated regardless of whether the interconnection occurs at an end-office or tandem. However, as discussed below, we disagree with applicant that it is entitled to receive compensation for any costs incurred beyond the paging

terminal. Cook is only entitled to compensation for its paging-terminal costs, which, for the purposes of this arbitration, we will consider an "equivalent facility" to an end office switch.[1]

From the evidence in this case, Cook provides no transport because Pacific Bell provides the interoffice trunking facilities between its end office and/or tandem and Cook's paging terminal. Therefore, Cook is not entitled to compensation for transport between respondent's end-office or tandem and applicant's paging terminal.[2] Although Cook is not entitled to compensation for transport, neither will it be charged. We note that pursuant to a stipulation discussed below, Pacific will not charge for the facilities it uses to transport calls to Cook because Cook is awarded termination charges in this order.

3.3 Discrimination

Section 251(c)(2) requires nondiscriminatory interconnection for transmission and routing of telephone exchange service and exchange access. Applicant does not provide telephone exchange service or exchange access. Therefore, the nondiscrimination provision of this subsection does not control.

Section 252(i) further requires that respondent:

> "...shall make available any interconnection, service, or network element provided under an agreement approved under this section to which it is a party to any other requesting telecommunications carrier upon the same terms and conditions as those provided in the agreement."

Applicant asserts this obligates respondent to offer applicant the same rates paid to Pac-West Telecom, Inc. (Pac-West),

1 D.92-01-016, 43 CPUC2d 3, 15 (1992); cf. 47 C.F.R. § 51.701(d).

2 However, to the extent Cook owns facilities that connect from respondent's end-offices or tandems to Cook's paging terminals, applicant is entitled to compensation for transport.

as incorporated in the agreement advocated by applicant. We affirm the Arbitrator's findings that this is incorrect. The Pac-West agreement was not approved under the Act. Moreover, applicant is not a competitive local carrier as is Pac-West, and applicant's service is not the same as Pac-West's service. Also, there is no evidence on the record of this proceeding for us to determine whether the rates adopted in the Pac-West agareement are based on cost.

3.4 Public Policy

Congress provided under the Act that local exchange carriers interconnect with, and pay compensation for, the termination of traffic, to all telecommunications carriers that provide telecommunications services. In this case, applicant incurs costs for terminating traffic that originates on the respondent's network. No public policy is served by denying applicant the right to be compensated by the respondent (with which applicant interconnects) on just and reasonable terms for the costs that applicant incurs in transporting and terminating traffic.

3.5. Compensation Rates

Pursuant to Section 252(d)(2)(A), terms and conditions for reciprocal compensation of transport and termination must be based on a reasonable approximation of the additional costs of termination. Having reviewed the cost information submitted on the record, we do not feel confident in establishing final rates at this time. However, we are prepared to establish interim rates.

Cook's witness, Trout, introduced a cost study which purportedly arrived at a forward-looking cost of 2.4 cents per page. Trout's study assumed a network designed to serve 50,000 customers that would each generate 70 pages per month. His study included the costs for the paging terminal, for the paging transmitters, and for the facilities linking them together. Cook requests the termination rate that Pacific pays to Pac-West Telecom

under an agreement submitted to the Telecommunications Division in Advice Letter 18115, that would result in 0.95 cents compensation per page (less than Trout's cost estimate).

Pacific's witness Scholl testified that Trout's cost study was flawed and that after making adjustments, a more appropriate estimate would be from 0.006 to 0.088 cents per page depending on the type of paging terminal used and on the capacity assumptions for that paging terminal. Scholl argues that Trout's study did not conform to the consensus costing principles established in D.95-12-016. Scholl's adjustments exclude costs associated with paging transmitters and with the facilities that link the transmitters with the paging terminal. Scholl argues that these portions of the paging network are not traffic-sensitive and therefore should not be included in the TSLRIC of termination just as local loop facilities are not included the TSLRIC of termination in the wireline context. Also, Scholl attempts to eliminate costs that are not directly associated with paging service, such as voice features. Additionally, Scholl argues that Pacific should not have to compensate Cook for traffic sent over Type 1 (end-office) interconnections because Pacific avoids no costs by sending traffic that way.

We share Pacific's concerns that Cook has not submitted an acceptable cost study which is consistent with our adopted consensus costing principles adopted in D.95-12-016. Pacific's argument to limit the cost study to paging-specific features, to traffic originated by Pacific, and to traffic-sensitive elements is compelling. We are also concerned that Cook's study used a terminal which had excess capacity. Cook's cost study does not convince us to adopt the termination rates negotiated by Pacific Bell and Pac-West Telecom nor those rates established in arbitrations between Pacific and wireline CLCs as reasonable approximations of Cook's additional costs of termination. Furthermore, although we are not bound by the FCC's determination

on this issue, we note that First Report and Order presumes that a paging company's additional costs of termination would be less than those of the incumbent LEC, warns against the economic harm of imposing a rate based on the LEC's costs for termination, and specifically directs state commissions not to use the termination proxies established in the Order for establishing a paging carrier's termination rates (paragraphs 1092, 1093).

Pacific's adjustments to Cook's cost study appear to be reasonable, based on the record in this proceeding. Therefore, on an interim basis, we will accept Pacific's adjusted cost figure, 0.088 cents per page, based on an appropriately sized paging terminal, to set the termination rate. Pacific will pay the same rate to Cook regardless of whether the traffic is sent over a Type 2A (tandem) or a Type 1 connection.

We emphasize that these rates are interim. Therefore, we will keep this proceeding open to take further evidence to set a forward looking compensation rate which is consistent with our consensus costing principles. The assigned arbitrator will issue an ALJ ruling to set out a schedule for the second phase of the proceeding.

3.6 Rejection of Arbitrated Agreement and Filing of Agreement Consistent with the Terms of This Decision

For the reasons discussed, the arbitrated agreement does not meet the requirements of Sections 251(b)(5) and 252(d)(2). We therefore reject the agreement, and direct the parties to submit a new agreement that provides compensation to the applicant for its transport and termination of calls.

At the direction of the arbitrator, both parties previously presented a "dueling clause" agreement with sections that would be included or deleted as a consequence of the outcomes of the Arbitrator's Report (Ex. 20). We direct the parties to use that "dueling clause" agreement to file a new agreement that complies with the findings in this decision. In the dueling clause

agreement, compensation for use of local paging interconnection facilities (Section 3.2 of the agreement) depended upon the basis for our finding. To clarify our position, we find that Cook is not entitled to reciprocal compensation pursuant to the terms of the Pac-West agreement. Therefore, the alternate language for Section 3.2 which determines that Cook is entitled to reciprocal compensation on terms other than those in the Pac-West agreement, should be adopted. The resulting section 3.2 provides for the recurring facilities charges to be apportioned between the parties based on the each party's relative amount of originating traffic sent over those facilities. Consequently, Cook will not be assessed recurring charges for the facilities.

Findings of Fact

1. Applicant is a one-way paging company.

2. Applicant terminates traffic that originates on the respondent's network and provides termination of telecommunications.

3. Applicant incurs costs for terminating traffic that originates on the respondent's network.

4. The Pac-West agreement was not approved under the Act.

5. Applicant does not provide the same service as PacWest.

6. No public policy objectives are met by denying compensation to applicant for the cost of terminating calls that originate on respondent's network.

7. Cook submitted a cost study that estimates the termination cost as 2.4 cents per page.

8. Cook requests the termination rates negotiated between Pacific Bell and Pac-West Telecom in Advice Letter 18115. Under those terms, Cook would be compensated at aproximately 0.95 cents per page.

9. We have no evidence in this case that the rates adopted in the Pac-West agreement with Pacific are based on cost.

10. Cook's cost study does not comply with our consensus costing principles established in D.95-12-016.

11. Cook's cost study includes costs for the paging terminal, the paging transmitters, and the facilities that connect them.

12. Cook's cost study includes costs for features that can be used for non-paging service.

13. Cook's cost study includes costs for equipment that can be used for other purposes than terminating Pacific-originated traffic.

14. Based on the record in this proceeding, Pacific's adjustments to Cook's cost study are reasonable to set rates on an interim basis.

15. Pacific makes adjustments to Cook's cost study to arrive at a cost ranging from 0.006 to 0.088 cents per page depending on the paging terminal selected and the capacity assumptions employed.

Conclusions of Law

1. Congress' intent in providing mutual compensation under the Act was to ensure that carriers that historically had not been compensated for terminating calls originating on the local exchange carrier network henceforth be compensated.

2. Paying compensation to one-way paging companies for terminating traffic is consistent with the Telecommunications Act of 1996, as well as FCC orders and regulations implementing the Act.

3. Cook's arguments did not convince us to adopt the termination rates negotiated by Pacific Bell and Pac-West Telecom nor those established in arbitrations between Pacific and wireline CLCs as reasonable approximations of Cook's additional costs of termination.

4. Pacific's cost estimate of 0.088 cents per page should be adopted as the rate for compensation to Cook for local termination on an interim basis.

5. Pacific's refusal to pay compensation on Type 1 connections is unreasonable because Cook still incurs termination costs at its paging terminal.

6. Pacific shall pay the same compensation to Cook for local termination regardless of whether the parties are interconnected by a Type 1 or Type 2A connection.

7. Cook should only be entitled to compensation for its paging terminal costs which, for the purposes of this arbitration, should be considered an equivalent facility to an end office switch.

8. Based on the facts in this arbitration, Cook is not currently entitled to compensation for transport. However, if and when Cook owns facilities that connect from a Pacific Bell end office or tandem to a Cook Paging Terminal, then Cook will be entitled to compensation for transport.

9. The Interconnection Agreement between Cook Telecom, Inc. and Pacific Bell should be rejected because it is inconsistent with the Act.

10. A new agreement should be submitted that conforms with this decision.

11. This order should be effective today.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Pursuant to the Telecommunications Act of 1996, the "Conformed Interconnection Agreement Between Cook Telecom, Inc. And Pacific Bell (U 1001 C)," dated and filed April 28, 1997, is rejected.

2. The parties shall jointly file, within 10 days of the date of this order, the Interim Conformed Interconnection Agreement in the formats described in Ordering Paragraph 5 below. The parties shall base their agreement on the "dueling clause"

agreement (Exhibit 20) and make the following changes to that agreement:

a. The sections of the conformed agreement shall reflect our determination that Cook is entitled to reciprocal compensation.

b. Section 3.2 of the agreement shall reflect our determination that Cook Telecom, Inc. is not entitled to the terms of the Pac-West agreement.

c. The termination compensation rate in the pricing Schedule in Attachment III shall be as follows:

0.088 cents per Local Paging Call

3. The agreement as described in Ordering Paragraph 2 above shall become effective when filed.

4. The assigned arbitrator shall issue a Ruling to establish a procedural schedule for the establishment of final rates for local transport and termination.

5. The parties shall submit the Interim Conformed Interconection Agreement to the Commission's Administrative Law Judge Division on electronic disk in hypertext markup language format. Further, within 10 days of the date of this order, Pacific Bell shall enter the Conformed Interconnection Agreement in its world wide web server, and provide information to the Administrative Law Judge Division Computer Coordinator on linking the Conformed Interconnection Agreement on Pacific Bell's server with the Commission's web site.

6. This proceeding shall remain open to set final rates for local transport and termination.

This order is effective today.

Dated May 21, 1997, at Sacramento, California.

P. GREGORY CONLON
President
JESSIE J. KNIGHT, JR.
HENRY M. DUQUE
RICHARD A. BILAS
Commissioners

I dissent.

/s/ JOSIAH L. NEEPER
Commissioner

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, JOANNE D. INGRAM certify that the following is true and correct:

I am employed in the City and County of San Francisco, California, am over the age of eighteen years, and am not a party to the within entitled cause.

My business address is 425 California Street, Suite 2500, San Francisco, California 94104.

On June 12, 1997 I served the following document entitled: **COMMENTS BY ALLIED PERSONAL COMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA ("ALLIED") ON REQUESTS FOR CLARIFICATION OF THE COMMISSION'S RULES REGARDING INTERCONNECTION BETWEEN LECS AND PAGING CARRIERS**

by causing a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage pre-paid thereon and sent via first class mail, in the City of San Francisco to the interested parties below as follows:

Regina Keeney, Chief
Richard Metzger
Common Carrier Bureau
FCC
1919 M Street, N.W. - Room 500
Washington, D.C. 20554

William Kennard
Office of General Counsel
FCC
1919 M Street, N.W. - Room 614
Washington, D.C. 20554

Aliza Katz
Office of General Counsel
FCC
1919 M Street, N.W. - Room 623
Washington, D.C. 20554

Thomas Boasberg
Office of the Chairman
FCC
1919 M Street, N.W. - Room 814
Washington, D.C. 20554

James Caserly
Office of Commissioner Ness
FCC
1919 M Street, N.W. - Room 832
Washington, D.C. 20554

James Coltharp
Office of Commissioner Quello
FCC
1919 M Street, N.W. - Room 802
Washington, D.C. 20554

Suzanne Toller
Dan Gonzales
Office of Commissioner Chong
FCC
1919 M Street, N.W. - Room 844
Washington, D.C. 20554

Kathleen Abernathy
AirTouch Communications, Inc.
1818 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mark Stachiw
AirTouch Paging
12221 Merit Drive
Dallas, TX 75251

Cathleen A. Massey
AT&T Wireless Services, Inc.
1150 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Judith St. Ledger-Roty
Reed Smith Shaw & McClay
1301 K Street, N.W., E. Tower
Washington, D.C. 20005

Paul E. Dorin
Southwestern Bell Telephone
One Bell Center, Room 3534
St. Louis, MI 63101

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on June 12, 1997 at San Francisco, California.

JOANNE D. INGRAM